DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 846 EA 005 297

AUTHOR	Robinson, John W.
TITLE	The Principal as Decision-Maker: Can Anyone Agree? Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Volume 14, Number 7.
INSTITUTION	Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
REPORT NO	OSSC-Bull-Vol-14-No-7
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Bibliographies; Board of Education Policy; Collective Negotiation; *Decision Making; *Educational Research; Governance; *Principals; Public Schools; Role Perception; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Surveys; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Militancy; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	Oregon

ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with an analysis of similarities and differences in role expectations among the populations of principals, teachers, superintendents, and board members in two suburban school districts in Oregon. It attempts to identify the levels of agreement within each of these populations regarding the principal's role in decisionmaking, ascertain the extent to which principals are accurate in their perceptions of the views of others, determine the extent of accuracy of the perceptions of others for the views of principals, and summarize the role of the school principal in decisionmaking according to consensus regarding specific behaviors presented in a role norm inventory. The author concludes that principals, superintendents, and board members are not yet willing to involve teachers in the decisionmaking role of the principal, even though teachers may want to be involved. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

BULLETIN

THE PRINCIPAL AS DECISION-MAKER
CAN ANYONE AGREE?

by

John W. Robinson

Vol. 14, No. 7 March, 1971

OREGON SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL
College of Education
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

EA 005 297

ED 079846

THE PRINCIPAL AS DECISION-MAKER:

CAN ANYONE AGREE?

by

John W. Robinson
Assistant Superintendent
Vashon School District
Vashon, Washington

Individual Copy Price - $2.50

Decision-Making is a Complex Task:

Dr. Robinson's study shows why the contemporary principal finds himself in a quandary. His teachers, superintendent and board members all find it difficult to agree on his decision-making role and how they should relate to it.

Dr. Robinson concludes that principals, superintendents and board members are not yet willing to involve teachers in the decision-making role of the principal, even though teachers may want to be involved.

-- *The Editors*

Adviser: Dr. Paul Kambly

VITA

Name: John W. Robinson

Educational Background:

Oregon College of Education	B. S.	1953
University of Oregon	M. S.	1959
University of Oregon	Ph.D.	1970

Professional Experience:

Teacher, Parkrose Public Schools, Portland, Oregon, 1955-60.
Vice Principal, Junior High School, Parkrose Public Schools, Portland, Oregon, 1960-61.
Acting Principal, Junior High School, Parkrose Public Schools, Portland Oregon, 1961-62.
Vice Principal, Junior High School, Parkrose Public Schools, Portland, Oregon, 1962-63.
Elementary Principal, Parkrose Public Schools, Portland, Oregon, 1964-67.
Administrative Assistant, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1968-69.
Instructor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1969-70.
Assistant Superintendent, Vashon School District, Vashon, Washington, 1970-

Educational Organizations:

Phi Beta Sigma
Phi Delta Kappa

INTRODUCTION

The governance of the public school as it relates to administrative decision making has become of increasing concern all over the country. In the trend toward teacher involvement and in the pressure of community interest, is the school principal stepping down or stepping up? Is he being phased out of his traditional role as administrative decision maker by the new group approach or is he beginning to play a more significant role?

Beginning in the early 1960's much has been written regarding the desires of teachers to have a greater share in the decision-making process in our public school systems. The focus of the writings has been on the underlying causes for the apparent changes in the behavior of teachers and teaching organizations and on how administrators should react to these changes. Most frequently, the term "teacher militancy" appears in the literature to describe this phenomenon. Regardless of the descriptive term, the movement appears to be related to events outside the profession.

In a study of teachers' unions, Moskow (1966) describes rather specific factors which appear to be contributing to conflict within the educational system:

(1) Conflict over the allocation of funds to public education.

(2) Conflict over the rules that govern the employment relationships of a teacher (e.g., class size, number of teaching assistants, class schedules, transfer plans, seniority).

(3) Conflict over the professional function of the teacher.

(4) Conflict due in part to AFL-CIO attempts to organize teachers.

(5) Conflict resulting from an increasing percentage of male teachers and a decreasing turn-over rate.

(6) Conflict caused by the bureaucratization of schools, primarily the result of the reorganization of smaller districts.

Moskow concludes, "...teachers are anxious to have a voice in the determination of their salaries and working conditions (p. 5)."

Boynan (1966) agrees with Moskow, for he views the major factors influencing the emergent role of teachers as (1) changes due to reorganization of districts, (2) changes in the posture of professional organizations, and (3) changes in teachers as individuals (e.g., increased level of preparation and expertise and increased number of males in the profession). A Port Angeles school board member, addressing the National School Boards Association in 1965, appears to agree when she voiced no surprise that teachers wanted a greater voice in educational matters since they have had to upgrade their training and assume extensive responsibilities. (NSBA Proceedings, 1965). In addition to changes within the educational system, Boynan (1966) sees changes in the external environment as being a major influential factor on teacher behavior.

Wood (1969) describes the movement as a kind of predictable revolution among educational practitioners. He sees it as concomitant to the technical, economic, political, and social revolution that is taking place in the country today.

Some of the bases for teacher militancy, then, can be viewed as manifestations of the revolutionary framework of our times. Evidence of this is observable in peace power, black power, and student power, as well as other protest movements. Each of these movements appears to possess a similar basic aim--increased participation in the decision-making process.

Goldhammer (1968), noting the addition of men to the profession and the increased competence of teachers as significant to the changing behavior of members of the educational profession, sees two other factors as influential—increased dedication on the part of board members and increased resentment by the public toward school systems which are primarily custodial. He further states:

> In spite of these changes, I submit to you that the basic structure of governance of the public schools has changed almost imperceptively in the past 30 years. As one of my colleagues has said, it changes, but with glacial speed. The patterns of governance. . . in our public schools have not undergone the kinds of modification that would be indicated as a result in the changed quality of the teaching profession, the changed perspectives of school board members, and the changed demands of the public. We are still using basically an hierarchical model with all authority vested in the top (p. 3).

In a discussion of the role of the building principal relating to governance, Rudman (1969) comments:

> The building administrator is a fundamental element in the governance of education in the United States. What he does and the organizational climate he induces has considerable effect upon the work of the teachers in the building and they, in turn, upon the work of their students. For years, principals, pundits, and professors have been discussing the tasks of the administrator; they have assured themselves that either the role of the principal was changing or that it had never truly emerged. Yet, while the participants in the dialogue were busy with the topic, a dangerous head of steam was building up among the teaching staffs in countless buildings--a pressure that was to erupt with the first of the collective negotiation sessions and that was to spread to other districts, in other states (p. 61).

One might conclude that the result of the bargaining will lead to greater participation on the part of teachers in decision making and policy development and that these practices will, in turn, lead to more effective school programs.

Lieberman and Moskow (1966) express concern that decisions arrived at through collective negotiations may not always be in the best interests of the public. They propose the separation of professional matters from employment matters. They describe professional matters as those which should be decided by teachers and employment matters as those which should be decided by the administration. They conclude by saying:

> One must look to the consequences of having a decision made by teachers or by administrators; then on the basis of a judgment as to which set of consequences is more in the public interest, one can decide who should make the decision (p. 242).

Lieberman and Moskow also indicate that teachers should have the authority to set standards for entry into the profession, but that the power to employ a teacher in a particular school system should not be the prerogative of the teachers within the system. In addition, they believe teachers should have the authority to expel an individual from the teaching profession, but that the dismissal of a teacher in a specific school system should be controlled by the administration, even though the procedures by which these actions are carried out are properly subject to negotiations.

It has been argued that the negotiations process will make the principal the forgotten man, and that by being identified as a member of the school management team, the relationship between principal and teachers will suffer a degree of alienation (Redfern, 1969). Traditionally, the principal has played a "middle man" role involving the implementation at the local school level of administrative policies developed in the superintendent's office (Spindler, 1963). Until recently, teachers have been either content to accept this function of the principal, or unwilling to complain about it and have accommodated themselves to the role. They have also expected the

principal to communicate their concerns to the superintendent and to the school board. These expectations for the role of the principal have not facilitated to any significant degree the development of broad base decision making involving teachers. However, direct negotiations between teachers and the school board are introducing new and significant elements in educational decision making. There is, for instance, the restriction of unilateral decision making by school administrators (Lieberman and Moskow, 1966). Another apparent result of negotiations has been efforts on the part of school boards to move the "middle man" away from the middle. A statement from an Oregon School Boards Association legislative newsletter (OSBA #15, 1969) reflects such effort:

> Unless local school officials can receive affirmative action on Senate Bill 337, it means that boards will have to develop other sources of information and assistance in analyzing teacher requests since the supervisory personnel--being paid to help administer school district operations--are being represented by those they are expected to supervise and give leadership to. It appears that principals and other administrative personnel prefer to be in a "head teacher" capacity rather than in an administrative position. Salaries and other extra benefits will probably have to be adjusted in the long run to reflect this philosophy (p. 1).

Currently, the focus of negotiations is upon salaries and related economic matters; however, there is considerable evidence (Perry and Wildman, 1966; Asnard, 1968) that teachers are interested in developing a broader base of power. As gains are made by teachers at the bargaining table, patterns of decision making will have to be altered forcing some adjustment on the part of principals. Instead of becoming the forgotten man, Dykes (1966) predicts the building administrator will play a more powerful and influential role. He writes:

> However, it is contended here that greater involvement of teachers in decision making is as much a function of the emergent role of the administrator as the impelling movements now underway in education generally. Each of the characteristics identified with the emergent administrative role is directly related to and in some measure dependent upon, the involvement of teachers in decision making.
>
> The more powerful role ascribed to the administrator cannot be achieved without the development and utilization of the power potential of the teaching personnel within the system. If this power is to be manifested, the teachers must be organized and involved meaningfully in decision making so as to have a hand in formulating what it is they are asked to support (p. 31).

In addition, Dykes contends resistance of administrators and school boards to increased participation of teachers in decision making is undesirable.

Representatives of teachers' organizations indicate they definitely want to be able to participate to a greater extent than they are presently doing, and some indicate a strong desire to limit the authority of the building principal (Eugene Register Guard, 1969).

In posing the following question, Lieberman and Moskow (1966) voice concern about the "authority role" of principals.

> What about the disciplinary role of administrators? When this question is raised, it is often said that disciplinary power should be in the hands of teachers. This is supposed to be essential to their professional status. Doctors and lawyers discipline their own ranks, hence so should teachers. Clarification of this view or this attitude, perhaps, in the context of collective negotiations is essential (p. 242).

An Analysis of the Role of the Principal in Decision Making

This study is concerned with an analysis of similarities and differences in role expectations among the populations of principals, teachers, superintendents, and board members in two suburban school districts in Oregon. As with all positions, the position of school principal is accompanied by a set of behavioral rules defining his role. The expectations that principals, teachers, superintendents, and board members have for the principal's role in decision making is the basis for this study.

More specifically, it was the purpose of this study to identify the levels of agreement within each of the populations and to determine the extent of agreement among the populations; to ascertain the extent to which principals are accurate in their perceptions of the views of others; to determine the extent of accuracy of the perceptions of others for the views of principals; and to summarize the role of the school principal in decision making according to consensus regarding specific behaviors presented in the role-norm inventory.

Research Design

A principal's role-norm inventory, shown in Appendix A, was constructed, containing 41 role-norm items related to decision making. The inventory was administered to the entire population of principals, superintendents, and board members. In the case of principals, the inventories were collected as they were completed; superintendents and board members completed the inventories privately and returned them later by mail.

A random selection of three elementary buildings and one secondary building was made from each district and the entire population of teachers from the selected buildings was administered inventories which were collected upon completion.

The Inventory

That basic part of the interview form which yielded data for this study (some demographic data were also collected) constitutes a role-norm inventory for the position of public school principal. Of the 41 items included in the inventory, 12 pertain to the category of decision making in personnel matters; and another 12 pertain to the category of decision making in administrative organization. The remaining 17 items pertain to decision making in the area of curriculum.

The five response categories provided for each role-norm statement were stated in behavioral terms:

(1) Principal decides independently

(2) Principal decides after consultation

(3) Consensus

(4) Teachers decide, principal retains veto

(5) Teacher decides independently

One copy of the inventory was provided for each teacher, superintendent, and board member on which he checked each item twice, indicating his own view and his perception of the view of the "typical" principal. Each principal was given a copy of the inventory on which to check each item four times, indicating his own view and his perception of the views of teachers, superintendents, and board members.

Basic Measures

The role-norm inventory was developed to measure the extent of consensus within groups and the extent of agreement between groups. Two measures were used in the analysis of the data: (1) an Agreement Score and (2) a mean Response Score.

The first measure, referred to as an Agreement Score, is designed to measure the extent of agreement within populations. However, because no assumptions could be made regarding equal intervals in each of the five response categories, a simple measure of cumulative relative frequency distribution, developed by Robert Leik of the University of Washington, was selected (Leik, 1966). This measure has a theoretical range from -1.00, where 50 percent of the responses are polarized in the extreme categories, through 0.0 where 20 percent of the responses are in each of the five categories, to +1.00 where 100 percent of the responses are in one of the five categories.

An Agreement Score less than 0.0 results from a bi-modal distribution and is a measure of dissensus. An Agreement Score of 0.0 indicates a complete lack of consensus due to equal dispersion of scores in all five categories. An Agreement Score above 0.0 is regarded as a degree of consensus due to the clustering of scores. As the clustering of scores approaches unimodality, consensus approaches complete agreement and the scores, in percentage form, approach +1.00.

The second measure, referred to as a mean Response Score, is designed to indicate the average of the responses and is obtained by assigning a value of one to five to each of the response categories in turn from "principal decides independently" to "teachers decide independently." This statistic is applied to determine the extent of agreement between populations. The overall difference between two populations is determined by comparing the average of the mean Response Score over all items in the inventory or from role norm to role norm within the inventory. Agreement Scores and Response Scores for all 41 role-norm items for each of the populations are in Appendices B, C, and D.

Summary of Findings

Views and Perceptions of Principals

Agreement among principals regarding their role in decision making is moderate, the mean level of agreement being slightly above 50 percent. The levels of agreement vary somewhat from role to role, with principals being in highest agreement for their behavior in the personnel role. Agreement Scores vary considerably from one role norm to another, ranging from less than zero to nearly complete consensus. This pattern persists when principals are reporting their perceptions of the views of others and there is a definite tendency for principals to be in low or high agreement regarding the views of others whenever they are in low or high agreement among themselves.

An interesting finding concerning the views of principals is that they perceive themselves to be in the middle between the liberal views of teachers and the conservative views of superintendents and board members. They see teachers as desiring a greater share in the decision-making process than principals believe desirable, and they feel superintendents and board members are less willing to share than principals consider suitable. A possible explanation is that principals have been unable to accept the suggestions of the many professors of educational administration who recommend "staff involvement" and "democratic administration." It could also be that principals perceive teachers as having become "too militant" in the past few years.

It is also worth noting that the size of the population appears to be inversely related to the extent to which principals perceive agreement within that population. The average Agreement Scores for the principals' perceptions of the views of teachers, board members, and superintendents are .427, .556,

and .573, respectively. It may be easier for principals to stereotype the few superintendents with whom they come in contact than the many teachers with whom they are involved.

The range of Agreement Scores for principals' own views is from .133 to .767, the average Agreement Score being .552. These data are similar to findings reported by Foskett (1967). The norms and the populations in this study are different from those used in the study by Foskett, however, the results are similar and tend to support Foskett's conclusions that the normative structure is subject to limited consensus even among the population of school principals who are members of a relatively homogeneous profession.

Analysis of the distribution of responses indicates that principals believe it appropriate that they control about two-thirds of the decisions. Principals made 65.6 percent of their responses in Category 1 (Principal Decides Independently) and Category 2 (Principal Decides after Consultation). In Role 2 (Personnel) principals made 87.7 percent of their responses in Categories 1 and 2, indicating that they feel this is an area where teachers should have little say.

The Views and Perceptions of Others

The range of agreement scores from one role norm to another for the views of others is similar to that of principals. All three populations are in higher agreement for principals' behavior related to the personnel role and feel it is more appropriate for principals to control decision making in this role than the other two. Teachers have the lowest mean Agreement Scores both on their own views and on their perceptions; and superintendents have the highest agreement on their own views and on the views of principals.

Teachers' Views. The mean level of agreement among teachers is approximately 40 percent; the range of agreement from norm to norm is from less than zero to above 80 percent.

Teachers have the highest average Response Score, indicating a desire for greater participation in decision making and see principals as being less willing to share decision making with them in all 41 role-norm items.

Superintendents' Views. The mean level of agreement among superintendents is from near zero to complete consensus.

Superintendents also perceive principals to hold views that are more conservative than their own regarding the sharing of decision making with teachers. For 26 of the role-norm situations, superintendents feel the views of principals are more conservative and for only seven of the norms do they perceive principals to hold views more liberal than their own. The average Response Score for superintendents is next highest to that of teachers.

Board Members' Views. The mean level of agreement among board members is approximately 60 percent, the range of Agreement Scores being from zero to complete consensus.

Board members have the lowest average Response Score, indicating that they are least willing for teachers to participate in decision making. Board members see principals as holding views more liberal than their own. For 26 of the role norms they perceive principals to be more willing to share decision making with teachers than board members believe is desirable, and in only five situations do board members believe the views of principals are more conservative than their own.

Comparison of the Views of Others. Teachers believe principals should control somewhat more than one-third of the decisions made; superintendents believe it is appropriate for principals to control approximately one-half of the decisions; while board members believe principals should control more than three-fourths of the decisions made.

Differences between the views of board members and teachers are greatest, the average difference for all 41 role-norm items being .78 more than three-fourths of a response category. For Role 3 (Curriculum and Instruction), teachers and board members differ by .94, nearly one full response category.

These differences partially corroborate the perceptions of principals that they are in the middle between the conservatism of board members and the liberalism of teachers. The views of superintendents differ less with the views of teachers than they do with the views of board members.

Comparison of the Views of Principals with the Views of Others

Principals' Own Views of Their Role Compared with the Views of Others. The views of principals differ most with the views of teachers and least with the views of superintendents. The average difference between the views of principals and the views of teachers approximates one-half of one response category; whereas the difference between principals and superintendents is one-fourth of one response category.

Differences between superintendents and principals are less extensive, but in cases where there are differences between these two groups, principals are less willing to share decision making than are the superintendents.

It is also of interest to note that although teachers feel it is proper for principals to have considerable say in the area of personnel decisions (Role 2), they still differ more with principals in this role than in the other two roles. The implication is that although teachers believe principals should be making many independent decisions in matters pertaining to personnel, teachers want principals to share more of the decision making in this role than principals are willing to share.

Principals' Perceptions and the Actual Views of Others. The principals' ability to accurately forecast the views of others varies from one population to another. Principals are most accurate in predicting the views of teachers and least accurate in predicting the views of superintendents. The average error rate for principals when predicting the views of superintendents is .53. The indication is that principals, on the average, are in error by more than one-half of one response category and perceive superintendents to be more conservative than superintendents report they are.

The question as to why principals are less able to predict the views of superintendents than they are the views of teachers is especially puzzling when one recalls that the views of principals are actually more similar to those of superintendents than to the views of teachers. It is possible that the nature of the contact principals have with teachers permits them to gain a more accurate estimate of teachers' views, and that contact with superintendents is essentially limited to structured situations, such as meetings, which afford less opportunity for gathering data on the views of superintendents. However, there also remains the possibility that the superintendents behave differently from the inventory responses. They may report their most democratic feelings, but feel it necessary, in practice, to take a hard line in their reactions toward teachers.

The data indicate that principals perceive teachers as wanting to become more involved in decision making--a fact which is supported by the responses of teachers. In turn, teachers perceive principals as less willing to share decision making with them--a fact which is supported by the responses of principals.

Perception of Others Compared with Actual Views of Principals. There is little variance between the abilities of teachers, superintendents, and board members to predict accurately the views of principals. The error rate of superintendents and of teachers is .22 and .24, respectively; and for board members the error rate is .29.

There are some differences in the direction of the error. Teachers and superintendents predict principals to be more conservative than principals report they are; and board members perceive principals to be more liberal than principals indicate they are.

Comparison of the Views of Teachers within and between Districts

Response patterns indicate teachers differ in amount of agreement between school buildings within a district to the same extent that they do between districts.

The mean Response Score for all teachers for the 41 role norms in the inventory is 2.77. Two buildings from each district have Response Scores greater than the above score, and two buildings from each district have scores less than the above mean. This pattern suggests that teachers in one district are no more and no less interested in participating in the decision-making process than teachers from the other district.

Comparison of the Effects of Selected Demographic Facts upon Responses of Principals and Teachers

Analysis of demographic data indicates that the amount of classroom teaching experience, the amount of administrative experience, the level of current administrative experience, and the location of administrative experience have little effect on principals' views.

Analysis of demographic data collected from teachers reveals:

1. Male teachers are more desirous of participating in decision making than female teachers;
2. Younger teachers are more desirous of participating in decision making than are older teachers;
3. Less experienced teachers report wanting greater participation in decision making than more experienced teachers;
4. Secondary teachers express greater desire to participate in decision making than do elementary teachers; and
5. Professional affiliation, level of college degree, and location of teaching assignment appear to have no effect on the views of teachers.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings summarized in the preceding section, it seems logical to conclude:

1. Principals are in only moderate agreement regarding their role in decision making. The amount of their agreement varies from role to role, with principals being in higher agreement on their role in matters pertaining to personnel.
2. Others vary in the extent of their agreement on the principals' behavior, teachers being in lowest agreement and superintendents in highest agreement. Populations of others are also in highest agreement on the personnel role.

3. Principals are in closer agreement with superintendents regarding the principal's role than they are with teachers and board members. Principals and teachers are in greatest disagreement.
4. Principals are most accurate in forecasting the views of teachers and least accurate in predicting the views of superintendents.
5. Others predict the views of principals with essentially equal accuracy.
6. Selected demographic facts appear to have no effect on the views of principals. Sex, age, level of teaching, and amount of teaching experience appear to affect the views of teachers.

In general, it appears that, although teachers are asking for greater participation in decision making, their expectations do not seem to be excessive or strongly militant. However, principals, superintendents, and board members do not yet appear to be willing to have teachers involved in the decision-making role of the principal to the extent that teachers want to be involved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asnard, R. R. "Directions in Negotiations." National Elementary Principal, 1968, 48 (1), 21-23.

Boynan, N. J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School." In R. B. Allen & J. Schmid (eds.), Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Dykes, A. R. "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships." In R. B. Allen & J. Schmid (eds.), Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Foskett, J. M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal. Eugene, Or.: University of Oregon, The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.

Goldhammer, K. "Administrators in Negotiations." Oregon Education, 1968, 43 (3), 3-5, 7, 42-43.

Leik, R. K. "A Measure of Ordinal Consensus." Pacific Sociological Review, 1966, 9 (2), 85-90.

Lieberman, M., and Moskow, M. H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Moskow, M. H. Teachers and Unions. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, 1966.

National School Boards Association. Proceedings of the 1965 Convention of the National School Boards Association Boston, Massachusetts. Evanston, Ill.: NSBA, 1965.

Oregon School Boards Association. Legislative News Bulletin, 1969, 15, 1.

Perry, C. R., and Wildman, W. A. "A Survey of Collective Activity among Public School Teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, 1966, 2 (2), 133-151.

Redfern, G. B. "Negotiation Changes Principal-Teacher Relationships." In Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1969.

Rudman, H. C. "The Dirty Dozen, the Principal and His Teachers." In Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1969.

Spindler, G. D. "The Role of the School Administrator." In G. D. Spindler (ed.), Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Wood, T. C. "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" In Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1969.

APPENDIX A

ROLE-NORM STATEMENTS

Administration and Organization

1. In determining the number of teachers on supervision duty (e.g., playground duty or for athletic activities or dances) . . .
2. In determining duty schedules . . .
3. In creating a master schedule involving assignment of teachers to rooms and the time of day for classes . . .
4. In modifying services or the time of service in the cafeteria . . .
5. In determining regulations concerning attendance at PTA meetings . . .
6. In determining the criteria by which students are assigned to classes, sections, or teachers . . .
7. In determining daily or hourly schedules within a classroom . . .
8. In deciding who may call for a faculty meeting . . .
9. In developing a set of recommendations for educational specifications for an addition or the remodeling of a building . . .
10. In deciding when faculty meetings should be held . . .
11. In determining priorities for that portion of the budget which affects the individual building . . .
12. In modifying services or time of service in the library, following consultation with the librarian . . .

Personnel

13. In selecting new teaching staff . . .
14. In determining teaching load . . .
15. In selecting staff members for extra pay assignments . . .
16. In determining placement on tenure for teachers . . .
17. In determining which teachers, if any, should be recommended for dismissal . . .

18. In selecting teachers for grade level or department chairman . . .

19. In selecting which staff members will be involved in summer school teaching . . .

20. In selecting non-certificated staff members . . .

21. In selecting a rating instrument for evaluating teachers . . .

22. In selecting staff members for extended contract . . .

23. In determining which teachers, if any, should be selected to be transferred to another building in order to balance staffs . . .

24. In determining when the teacher's day begins and ends in the building . . .

Curriculum and Instruction

25. In selecting instructional problems to study . . .

26. In determining whether lay citizens should participate on a curriculum committee . . .

27. In selecting film strips and other supplementary teaching materials . . .

28. In selecting from state adopted texts . . .

29. In selecting AV equipment and other classroom equipment . . .

30. In determining procedures for evaluating various instructional programs . . .

31. In determining which teachers should serve on a curriculum committee . . .

32. In determining which staff members may be released on professional leave to attend workshops or conferences . . .

33. In determining when the principal should visit a classroom . . .

34. In determining whether recommendations of a curriculum committee should be implemented . . .

35. In deciding whether a pilot project pertaining to an instructional program should be accepted . . .

36. In determining which community drives or contests merit school participation . . .

37. In determining the acceptability of teachers trading classes or doing cooperative teaching . . .

38. In determining whether proposed resource units or curriculum guides should be accepted . . .

39. In determining whether the principal should observe in the classroom, for purposes of improving instruction . . .

40. In determining appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes . . .

41. In determining what professional reading materials will be purchased for the building . . .

APPENDIX B

Agreement Scores (AS) and mean Response Scores (RS) of principals, teachers, superintendents, and board members for 12 role-norm items in the administration and organization role

Role Norm	Principals AS	Principals RS	Teachers AS	Teachers RS	Superintendents AS	Superintendents RS	Board Members AS	Board Members RS
1	.657	1.94	.510	2.58	1.000	2.00	.583	1.50
2	.493	2.22	.331	2.58	.881	2.14	.500	1.80
3	.706	2.04	.481	2.27	.881	2.14	.667	1.60
4	.542	1.96	.379	2.39	.643	2.14	.667	2.20
5	.150	2.57	.067	3.58	.405	2.86	.000	2.60
6	.444	2.47	.314	2.79	.405	2.71	.500	1.80
7	.133	3.36	.113	3.94	.167	3.57	.333	3.60
8	.500	2.04	.363	1.98	.405	2.57	.167	2.00
9	.567	2.44	.514	2.64	.881	2.86	.667	2.20
10	.617	2.06	.403	2.07	.643	2.57	.417	2.30
11	.733	2.12	.474	2.37	.524	2.57	.583	1.90
12	.383	2.38	.217	2.80	.524	3.00	.500	2.20

APPENDIX C

Agreement Scores (AS) and mean Response Scores (RS) of principals, teachers, superintendents, and board members for 12 role-norm items in the personnel role

Role Norm	Principals AS	Principals RS	Teachers AS	Teachers RS	Superintendents AS	Superintendents RS	Board Members AS	Board Members RS
13	.717	1.70	.427	1.73	.643	1.57	.833	1.20
14	.733	2.00	.412	2.59	.524	2.00	.500	1.60
15	.767	1.76	.450	2.34	.881	1.86	.667	1.60
16	.739	1.31	.496	2.20	.769	1.29	1.000	1.00
17	.624	1.45	.598	2.03	.881	1.14	.917	1.10
18	.575	2.12	.302	2.56	.762	2.29	.667	1.60
19	.755	2.02	.306	2.58	.762	1.71	.583	2.10
20	.608	1.47	.413	1.80	.643	1.86	.833	1.20
21	.641	2.73	.607	3.15	.881	3.14	.750	2.30
22	.706	1.84	.505	2.23	.881	1.86	.583	1.70
23	.641	1.73	.412	2.45	.762	1.71	.917	1.90
24	.608	1.47	.149	2.39	.762	2.00	.583	1.50

APPENDIX D

Agreement Scores (AS) and mean Response Scores (RS) of principals, teachers superintendents, and board members for 17 role-norm items in the curriculum and instruction role

Role Norm	Principals AS	Principals RS	Teachers AS	Teachers RS	Superintendents AS	Superintendents RS	Board Members AS	Board Members RS
25	.510	3.04	.309	3.48	.643	3.43	.667	2.80
26	.510	2.47	.521	2.88	.762	2.71	.667	1.80
27	.592	3.90	.544	4.45	.762	3.71	.667	3.60
28	.461	3.51	.281	4.09	.762	3.29	.417	2.70
29	.379	3.04	.245	3.65	.524	2.71	.250	3.10
30	.526	2.82	.542	3.20	.762	2.71	.500	2.40
31	.624	2.25	.316	2.96	.524	2.57	.500	1.60
32	.575	2.00	.338	2.44	.881	1.86	.667	1.40
33	.363	1.76	.306	2.19	.524	2.00	1.000	1.00
34	.493	2.45	.540	3.02	.643	2.86	.583	1.90
35	.542	2.43	.481	2.95	.762	3.00	.583	2.50
36	.467	1.96	.345	2.65	.167	2.14	.583	1.50
37	.428	2.94	.220	3.55	.286	3.00	.583	2.10
38	.477	3.20	.342	3.39	.542	3.29	.500	2.40
39	.575	1.51	.295	2.35	.405	1.71	.500	1.60
40	.542	2.27	.281	2.97	.405	2.86	.417	2.50
41	.526	3.33	.329	3.44	.524	3.57	.583	2.70